



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/072,432	02/08/2002	Phyllis B. Siegel	1050-5	3909

7590 11/28/2005
JOHN LEZDEY & ASSOCIATES
2875 MCI DRIVE
PINELLAS PARL, FL 33782

EXAMINER

EL ARINI, ZEINAB

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1746

DATE MAILED: 11/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/072,432

Applicant(s)

SIEGEL ET AL.

Examiner

Zeinab E. EL-Arini

Art Unit

1746

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 September 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 39-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 39-44 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

The amendment and remarks filed 9/26/05 have been acknowledged and entered. In the amendment to the specification, page 1, second paragraph, "filed 08/30/2000" should be changed to read "filed 06/30/2000".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, stated in paper No. 062705 has been withdrawn in view of applicants' amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 39-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rajaiah et al. (6,491,896 in combination with Waggoner (5,709,546).

Rajaiah et al. disclose a method and an antimicrobial composition for cleaning denture. The antimicrobial composition for removing biofilm from denture, comprises potassium iodide (col. 6, line 31), an organic acid such as citric acid, --- (col. 5, lines 12-15), an oxidizing agent such as perborate, bicarbonate, ---, see col. 5, lines 5-43, and col. 4, lines 30-53. The reference also discloses that the tablet compositions herein will provide excellent antimicrobial activity even in the absence of alkali metal persulfates. See col. 4, lines 53-56.

Art Unit: 1746

The reference does not teach cleaning medical line and the concentrations as claimed.

Waggoner discloses a method of removing biofilm from a medical line by using a solution comprises citric acid at a concentration of 0.1-1.0%. See col. 6, lines 52-62, col. 7, line 50, and col. 13, lines 39-50.

It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time applicant invented the claimed process to use the concentration of the citric acid taught by Waggoner in the Rajaiah et al. composition to enhance the cleaning process. It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to use the composition taught by Rajaiah et al to remove the biofilm from medical line of waggoner, because both references are from the same technical endeavor, which is cleaning medical equipment (denture, medical line,---). It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to adjust the concentration to obtain optimum results.

This rejection stated in paper No. 062705 is maintained.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 09/26/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

4. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

5. In response to applicant's argument with respect to Rajaiah et al. is not a pertinent reference since it has a later filing date, applicants' argument is unpersuasive, because the priority date for said reference is 3/19/01, however the priority date for the claimed invention is the filing date of this application which is 2/8/02. This is because the parent application 09/089,845 (filed 6/3/98), as originally filed, does not include claimed invention as is now claimed.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 1746

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Zeinab E. EL-Arini whose telephone number is (571) 272-1301. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Barr can be reached on (571) 272-1414. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Zeinab EL-Arini
Zeinab E. EL-Arini
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1746

ZEE
11/22/05